DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 313 24 HE 001 801

TITLE	Attitude Change of Freshman College Students Toward their Role as Raters of Teacher Behavior. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Freed-Hardeman Coll., Henderson, Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-D-037
PUB DATE	Jul 70
GRANT	OEG-4-9-520037-0052-057
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55
DESCRIPTORS	*College Freshmen, Counseling, *Higher Education, Orientation, Student Attitudes, *Student Opinion, Teacher Behavior, *Teacher Evaluation, *Teacher Rating
IDENTIFIERS	*Freed-Hardeman College

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were: (1) to determine if a student's attitude toward his role as a rater of teacher behavior could be changed to become more positive as a result of his orientation to that role; (2) to determine if the choice of the student to continue to rate could be influenced; and (3) to determine if the inter-rate variability could be reduced and a more uniform frame of reference developed. An attitude scale concerning the role of students as raters of teacher behavior was developed and administered to two equal groups, randomly drawn from the Fall 1969 freshman class at Freed-Hardeman College. Three group counseling sessions were held to explain the purpose of rating, importance of student opinions efforts being made by the faculty to improve instruction, use of the data collected and possible benefits to students which could occur as a result of their participation as raters. Findings indicated that the orientation did not significantly affect the student's attitude toward his role as a rater, nor his decision to continue as a rater. The control group was predominantly disposed toward rating, and hence there was no significant difference between the two groups on the choice of rating. (Author/AF)

ED043313

Bk 9-D-037

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-D-037

Grant No. OEG-4-9-520037-0052-057

ATTITUDE CHANGE OF FRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS TOWARD THEIR ROLE AS RATERS OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR

B. J. Naylor, Project Director

Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, Tennessee 38340

July, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE001801

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The investigator wishes to acknowledge the cooperation of the students at Freed-Hardeman College who gave their time as participants in the orientation sessions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		i
TABLE OF CONTENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		iii
SUMMARY		iv
PART I:	BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE	1
	I. Review of Literature	1
	II. The Problem	2
	III. Objectives and Hypotheses	2
PART II:	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	3
	I. The Sample	3
	II. The Attitude Scale	3
	III. The Treatment	4
PART III:	FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	5
	I. Results	5
	II. Conclusions	9
	III. Recommendations	12
REFERENCES		13
BIBLIOGRAPHY		14
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE		15
APPENDIX B - TREATMENT		18

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		PAGE
1.	Comparison of Gain Scores on Students in the Experimental and Control Groups Using a T-Test	6
2.	Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Scores on Items for Students in the Experimental Group Using a T-Test	7
3.	Difference Scores Matrix on Items for Matched Pairs in the Experimental Group and in the Control Group	8
4.	Comparison of Choices to Rate with Experimental and Control Groups Using Chi-Square Analysis	10
5.	Comparison of Pre-Test and Post-Test Variance for Experimental and Control Groups Using an "F" Ratio Test	11

SUMMARY

This project was undertaken (1) to determine if a student's attitude toward his role as a rater of teacher behavior could be changed to become more positive as a result of his orientation to that role, (2) to determine if the choice of the student to continue to rate could be influenced, and (3) to determine if the inter-rater variability could be reduced and a more uniform frame of reference developed.

The hypotheses tested were:

1. There is no significant difference in the attitudes of students receiving an orientation treatment to their role as raters of teacher behavior and the attitude of the control group.

2. There is no significant difference in the choices of students receiving an orientation treatment to continue to participate as a rater and the choices of the control group.

3. There is no significant difference in the variance of students receiving an orientation treatment and the variance of the control group.

An attitude scale concerning the role of students as raters of teacher behavior was developed and administered to two equal groups, N=50, which were randomly drawn from the freshman class at Freed-Hardeman College in the fall of 1969.

An orientation treatment was developed and administered to the experimental group. Three group counseling sessions were held to explain (1) the purposes of rating, (2) the importance of student opinions, (3) the efforts being made by the faculty to improve instruction, (4) the use to be made of the data collected, and (5) the possible benefits to students which could occur as a result of their participation as raters.

The analysis of data did not reveal a sufficient basis to reject the hypotheses. The control group was predominantly disposed toward rating and hence, no significant difference was observed between the two groups on the choice of rating. Although the change in attitude of the experimental group was not sufficiently large to be significant some changes in a positive direction were noted.

PART I

Background and Significance

I. Review of Literature

Part of the difficulty associated with the measurement of teacher effectiveness arises because of the variations in perception of those who rate. Kerlinger (1963) demonstrated the importance of the central directive state of the individual when making judgments concerning teacher effectiveness. He concluded that attitudes are an important part of the complex of psychological factors that influence judgments concerning teacher effectiveness.

Gage (1963) reported his optimism concerning the potential effect of student feedback as an effective way of changing teacher behavior. He found that feedback not only produced change in behavior, but also produced corresponding changes in the accuracy of teacher perceptions of their pupils' perceptions of them.

The validity of student rating of instructors was studied by Hudelson (1951). Using a scattergram of instructor's marks and students' ratings a coefficient of correlation was computed. He concluded that the relationship was not sufficiently large to conclude that students were allowing marks to influence their rating of teachers.

Remmers (1963) made the observation that bias may arise from the student's general liking or disliking of the rating object. Consequently, any study of rating must deal with the accuracy of social perceptions.

Despite the doubts and misgivings of some concerning the competency of students to judge good teaching, researchers recognize the contribution students can make by virtue of their role as consumers of the educational product.

A review of the literature indicated that the student's perception of the role he is asked to play is a crucial one, but few efforts have been made to influence these perceptions in a positive direction.

II. The Problem

The evaluation of teacher behavior is a vital concern of educators. Students are asked to play a major role in the rating process. Stecklein (1960)cited evidence that forty percent of eight hundred and four colleges and universities in the United States surveyed have used students' ratings of teachers.

Despite the fact that effort has been exerted to increase the reliability of ratings through training of the observers in the use of the instruments, little is known concerning the attitudes of the student toward this role and the extent to which the student's attitudes can be influenced in a positive direction.

Since students tend to rebel against involvement in activities which they do not fully understand, the problem was that of determining the extent to which an orientation treatment would cause a positive attitude change in students toward their role as raters of teacher behavior.

III. Objective and Hypotheses

The objective of the investigation was to develop and test an orientation treatment for freshmen college students that would cause a positive attitude change toward their role as raters of teacher behavior. It was anticipated that this attitude change would be reflected in the student's willingness to continue as a rater when given the choice to participate as a rater or not to participate.

Due to the unique and peculiar perceptions of the raters a considerable variability in ratings was assumed to exist. The orientation treatment was designed to reduce this inter-rater variability and to develop a more nearly uniform frame of reference for the raters.

The hypotheses tested were:

1. There is no significant difference in the attitudes of students receiving an orientation treatment to their role as raters of teacher behavior and the attitudes of the control group.

2. There is no significant difference in the choices of students receiving an orientation treatment to continue to participate as a rater and the choice of the control group.

3. There is no significant difference in the variance of students receiving an orientation treatment and the variance of the control group.

PART II

Methods and Procedures

I. The Sample

The subjects for this study were drawn from the freshmen students enrolling for the first time in the fall of 1969 at Freed-Hardeman College. Two equal groups, N=50, were randomly selected from the freshman class utilizing a table of random numbers.

Due to attrition over the treatment period, eleven from the control group and ten of the experimental group did not complete the year's work and consequently did not take the post test.

II. The Attitude Scale

An attitude scale concerning the role of students as raters of teachers was developed by the investigator with the assistance of Dr. Naim Sefein, the State University, Fredonia, New York.

Sixty statements were developed that were designed to elicit a response indicating an attitude toward rating. These sixty statements were submitted to an informal rating by three judges. These judges categorized the statements as favorable or not favorable to rating of teachers by students. The judges also rated the statements relative to ambiguity and clarity.

Thirty-six items that received unanimous approval by the judges were retained. A few items were reworded to change the direction of the statement in order to establish a balance between positively directed and negatively directed statements.

A Likert type scale of five categories was used with the thirty-six items. The attitude scale was field tested using college students enrolled in classes in social psychology, personality and education. In addition, five sophomores selected at random were asked to read and critique the scale for clarity. Their comments were helpful in the final revision of the statements.

The attitude scale was developed with the intent of soliciting from students their attitudes toward rating from the following standpoints:

1. Rating as a student responsibility vs. rating as a student privilege.

2. The usefulness of rating vs. its uselessness.

3. Rating as an important activity vs. rating as busy work.

A copy of the scale is included in this report, Appendix A.

Students in the control and experimental groups completed the scale as a pre test. After the orientation treatment, both groups responded to the scale in a post test setting in order to collect data for comparison and to determine the effect of the orientation treatment.

In the spring and before the last rating of teachers for the academic year, students in both the control and experimental groups were given the choice of rating or not rating their teachers. The decisions of students in each group were tabulated.

III. The Treatment

The orientation treatment was developed and administered to the experimental group. Three group counseling sessions were held to explain (1) the purposes of rating, (2) the importance of student opinion, (3) the efforts being made by the faculty to improve instruction, (4) the use to be made of the data collected, and (5) the possible benefits to students which could occur as a result of their participation as raters.

The first orientation was given on February 24, 1970 following the pre test. An explanation of the schedule for future sessions was given. Transparencies and samples of the University of Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire were used along with the discussion.

The second and third orientation sessions were held on April 7, 1970 and May 7, 1970. All sessions were held at 10:30 a.m. in one of the regular classrooms. The outlines for the three orientation sessions are included as Appendix B.

PART III

Findings and Analysis

I. Results

The central thrust of this investigation was to determine the attitude of students toward their role as raters and the extent to which these attitudes could be changed in a positive direction. An attitude scale was developed and used to collect these data. Also, a tabulation of student choices to participate or not to participate in the final rating for the year was made.

After the data was collected using the attitude scale it was processed by a computer and used to test the following hypotheses:

A. The first hypothesis was:

> "There is no significant difference in the attitudes of students receiving an orientation treatment to their role as raters of teacher behavior and the attitudes of the control group."

A comparison of gain scores on students in the experimental and control groups was made using a t-test. This data is contained in TABLE 1. The hypothesis cannot be rejected. The orientation treatment did not significantly change the attitudes of the experimental group. However, a comparison of pre test and post test scores on items for students in the experimental group as shown in TABLE 2 shows a significant change on Items 6, 8, 15, 25 and 32 of the attitude scale. This indicates the conviction of the experimental group that good teaching is an art to be developed, that student evaluations should be made public to other students in the selection of their courses, that rating should be done by students of all levels of achievement and that students have no one to blame but themselves for their failure.

A difference scores matrix on items for matched pairs in the experimental group and in the control group is shown in TABLE 3. The experimental group displayed an increase from pre test to post test on nineteen of the items.

Although the change in the experimental group was not large enough to be significant, some positive change did occur within the experimental group.

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF GAIN SCORES
ON STUDENTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS
USING A T-TEST

Group	Sample	Mean gain score	Standard deviation
Experimental	39	-0.82	12.61
Control	37	1.81	8.30

t = -1.08, N = 76, DF = 74

t prob. < .05 = 1.6882

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST SCORES
ON ITEMS FOR STUDENTS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL
GROUP USING A T-TEST

DF=87

Item	T-value	Significance	Item	T-value	Significance
1	-0.92	NS	19	-0.94	NS
2	0.85	NS	20	0.54	NS
3	-1.55	NS	21	1.10	NS
4	-0.17	NS	22	-0.20	NS
5	0.81	NS	23	0.72	NS
6	-2.09	.05	24	1.28	NS
7	-0.80	NS	25	-1.89	.05
8	2.18	.05	26	-0.15	NS
9	-1.65	NS	27	-0.91	NS
10	0.71	NS	28	1.31	NS
11	-0.16	NS	29	-0.69	NS
12	1.46	NS	30	-0.46	NS
13	0.76	NS	31	0.19	NS
14	-0.71	NS	32	-2.62	.01
15	-2.19	.05	33	-0.27	NS
16	-0.21	NS	34	-0.21	NS
17	-0.99	NS	35	0.22	NS
18	0.30	NS	36	-0.59	NS

Levels: $p < .05$ $t \geq 1.665$
$p < .01$ $t \geq 2.376$

TABLE 3
DIFFERENCE SCORES MATRIX ON ITEMS FOR MATCHED PAIRS IN THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP AND IN THE CONTROL GROUP*

Item	Groups		Item	Groups	
	Experimental	Control		Experimental	Control
1	0	+	19	+	0
2	-	0	20	-	+
3	+	-	21	-	-
4	+	+	22	-	+
5	0	+	23	-	+
6	+	-	24	-	-
7	+	-	25	+	+
8	-	-	26	-	-
9	+	+	27	+	-
10	-	-	28	-	-
11	+	-	29	+	+
12	-	-	30	+	0
13	-	-	31	+	+
14	+	-	32	+	0
15	+	+	33	-	-
16	-	0	34	+	+
17	+	-	35	-	-
18	+	-	36	+	-
			Average	+	-

*Difference scores were formed by subtracting pre-test mean rankings from post-test rankings on the instrument. The +'s, -"s, and 0's recorded indicate increase, decrease, or no change from pre-test to post-test.

B. The second hypothesis was:

"There is no significant difference in the choices of students receiving an orientation treatment to continue to participate as a rater and the choices of the control group."

A comparison of choices to rate with the experimental and control groups was made using a chi-square test of significance. The data is presented in TABLE 4. The decision to keep on as a rater was independent of the subject's group and the hypothesis could not be rejected. However, the choice of the control group was so predominantly in favor of continuing to participate as a rater that there was very little possibility for a significant difference to occur between the experimental and control groups.

C. The third hypothesis was:

"There is no significant difference in the variance of students receiving an orientation treatment and the variance of the control group."

A comparison of pre test and post test variance for experimental and control groups was made using an "F" ratio test of significance. This data is contained in TABLE 5. There was no significant difference between the variances of the experimental and control groups, therefore the hypothesis cannot be rejected. The treatment was not effective in causing a reduction in inter-rater variability.

II. Conclusions

The treatment was not effective in causing a significant attitude change in a positive direction in the experimental group as compared with the control group. A difference scores matrix did indicate some positive change within the experimental group.

The control group was affectively disposed toward continuing as raters. This is a desirable condition, and could be an explanation for the lack of significant difference in the choice of rating between the experimental and control groups.

The variance within both experimental and control groups was low. The treatment did not cause a significant reduction in inter-rater variability.

From a research standpoint, the treatment failed to produce a positive attitude change. The questionnaire did reveal the fact that students in both experimental and control groups recognize the importance of the role they play as raters of instruction and are willing to continue to rate teachers.

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF CHOICES TO RATE
WITH EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS
USING CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS

N = 77

	Group		
Choice of Rater	Experimental	Control	Total
Yes	38	32	70
No	2	5	7
	40	37	77

X^2 = .813

Level P < .05 X^2 = 3.841 df = 1

TABLE 5
COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST
VARIANCE FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS
USING AN "F" RATIO TEST

Group	DF	F-value	Significance
Experimental	87	1.20	NS*
Control	87	1.14	NS*

Level * P < .05

III. Recommendations

The role that students are asked to play as raters of teachers is tremendously important. Efforts should be made to continue the orientation of students to that role.

A replication of this study might be made on another campus with a differently oriented student body, where greater variability exists, and where students are less disposed to rating.

REFERENCES

Gage, N. L. "A Method for 'Improving' Teacher Behavior," Journal of Teacher Education, September 1963.

Hudelson, Earl. "The Validity of Student Rating of Instructors," School and Society, Vol. 73, No. 1897, April 1951.

Kerlinger, F. N. "Educational Attitudes and Perceptions of Teachers: Suggestions for Teacher-Effectiveness Research," The School Review, 71:1-11, 1963.

Remmers, H. H. "Rating Methods in Research on Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, N. L. Gage (ed.), p. 373. The American Education Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Stecklein, J. E. "Colleges and Universities - Programs: Evaluation," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd edition), C. W. Harris (ed.), p. 285-289. New York: McMillan Company, 1960.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barr, A. S. and Others. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness - A Summary of Investigations. Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publications, 1961.

Campbell, Donald T. and Stanley, Julian C. "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research on Teaching," Handbook of Research on Teaching, N. L. Gage (ed.), p. 183. The American Education Research Association. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Kiesler, Charles A., Collins, Barry E. and Miller, Norman. Attitude Change. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.

McKeachie, W. J. and Solomon, D. "Student Ratings of Instructors: A Validity Study," Journal of Educational Research, 51:379-90.

Pi Lambda Theta, The Evaluation of Teaching, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Schein, E. H. and Hall, D. T. "The Student Image of the Teacher," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 3 (3):330-331, 1967.

Weaver, C. H. "Instructor Rating by College Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51:24, 1960.

APPENDIX A

Freed-Hardeman College

Henderson, Tennessee

Student Attitudes Toward Rating of Instructors

Directions:

This is not a test. It is only a survey of opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. You are not asked to write your name and the information you provide will be used for research purposes only. Please give your frank and honest opinion.

The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part solicits your opinion regarding some school matters. You are requested to express your own opinion as accurately as you can. Give a response to every item. Some items may be hard to respond to. Do the best you can but do respond. Make each response on the appropriate space on the answer sheet.

The second part of the questionnaire solicits some general information about yourself. Please answer all the questions as accurately as you can, by making a check mark in the space to the left of the appropriate response.

Remember, this is not a test. The information you provide will be used in research only.

Thank you for your cooperation.

B. J. Naylor

Part I

Read each of the following statements and blacken the O which corresponds to your opinion (SA= Strongly Agree; A= Agree; U= Undecided; D= Disagree;and SD= Strongly Disagree)

		SA	A	U	D	SD
1.	A teacher is rarely interested in what students think about his instruction.	O	O	O	O	O
2.	Students who really want to learn should seek help from the instructor as soon as they encounter difficulty in the course.	O	O	O	O	O
3.	Requiring the rating of a teacher by his students forces the teacher to be sensitive to the needs of the students.	O	O	O	O	O
4.	Asking students to rate teachers is a gimmick used to give students the impression that teachers care about the students' needs and opinions.	O	O	O	O	O
5.	Students do not know enough about teaching to give meaningful evaluations of their teachers.	O	O	O	O	O
6.	A teacher is likely to take his job more seriously when he knows that students will rate him.	O	O	O	O	O
7.	Good teaching can be achieved only by employing good teachers.	O	O	O	O	O
8.	Student expectations vary in such a way that a teacher could never be able to satisfy all.	O	O	O	O	O
9.	Good teachers are born; student ratings cannot change those who do not have a natural ability to teach.	O	O	O	O	O
10.	Teachers are too busy with affairs other than their teaching to be able to do a good job of teaching.	O	O	O	O	O
11.	Students rate a teacher more in terms of their opinion of the content of the course than in terms of their opinion of the teacher's instructional procedure.	O	O	O	O	O
12.	Schools are created for students, and teachers should teach what students need.	O	O	O	O	O
13.	The college administration should take student ratings of instructors into consideration when deciding on teacher promotions.	O	O	O	O	O
14.	Student rating of teachers is one of the best ways of communicating to teachers the feelings of their students.	O	O	O	O	O
15.	Teacher evaluations made by students should be made public to permit other students to select their courses judiciously.	O	O	O	O	O
16.	Students should regard their rating of teachers as a serious responsibility.	O	O	O	O	O

17.	Every student should participate in rating his instructors.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
18.	Teachers are burdened with many demands that take their interest away from teaching.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
19.	The responsibility for evaluating teachers belongs to the college administration, not to the students.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
20.	It is the responsibility of every student to express his opinion regarding the quality of instruction he receives.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
21.	Above all else, teachers should be rated on their concern for students.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
22.	Most students do not take ratings of teachers seriously..	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
23.	Rating teachers will likely result in reducing academic standards because teachers will seek student approval by being lenient.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
24.	Students must let the teacher know when he is not teaching in such a way that they understand, even though they are unable to offer suggestions to correct the situation.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
25.	Rating teachers is a serious job that must be done only by students of above average intelligence and academic ability.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
26.	A good teacher senses what students feel about him without a rating scale.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
27.	Teachers are not very interested in students these days..	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
28.	Teachers usually do the best they can with the resources they have.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
29.	Student rating of instructors is an effective method for improving the quality of instruction.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
30.	Students must share the blame with the teacher for faulty instruction.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
31.	Teachers are only obligated to help those students who are sincere in seeking help.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
32.	Students have no one to blame but themselves for their failure to learn.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
33.	Teachers who ask for ratings are usually seeking compliments rather than the truth.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
34.	Teachers are victims of the general student discontent that is sweeping the schools of the nation these days. ..	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
35.	In keeping with the spirit of democracy, students should have a say concerning the kind of teaching they are to receive.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0
36.	The idea of rating teachers implies that teachers are not doing their best.	SA A U D 0 0 0 0

APPENDIX B

Orientation Treatment
Session One
February 24, 1970

I. Introduction

A. Explanation of the Orientation sessions

B. Topics to be discussed

1. The purposes of rating.

2. The importance of student opinions.

3. The efforts being made by the faculty to improve instruction.

4. The use to be made of the data collected.

5. The possible benefits to students which could occur as a result of their participation as raters.

II. The Purposes of Rating

A. As a means of helping the instructor spot areas of strength and weakness as seen through the eyes of the learner.

1. Show transparency of the University of Illinois printout for a typical teacher.

a. Identify areas of strength.

b. Identify areas of weakness.

2. Give students a copy of the Stanford and Purdue rating scales. Using transparencies, show how results are returned to the instructor.

a. Transparency one-----scene depicting a low rating on "Organization of Lesson".

b. Transparency two-----scene depicting a high rating on "Clarity of Aims".

c. Transparency three---scene showing two teachers comparing results of student ratings. "Comparison of Results of Student Ratings".

3. Emphasize to students that ratings of teachers should be made on the basis of instructional procedures rather than on interest of the course.

   a. Some courses have content high in interest.

   b. Some courses have content low in interest.

B. As a stimulus to an instructor to continuously assess his teaching procedures and techniques.

   1. Students come to the classroom from an "all-at-once" electronic age. They are likely to become impatient with approaches used 30 years ago. (Transparency four---scene showing an old-timer who has been lecturing for thirty years and refuses to change. "Change in Methodology")

   2. As the instructor receives a print-out each semester with ratings on items related to his instruction, his attention is directed to those areas of instruction which otherwise might be ignored.

C. To cause the instructor to become more <u>sensitive</u> to the needs of the <u>learner</u>.

   1. The ratings draw attention to the pacing of the lesson.

   2. Attending behavior should cause the instructor to become more cognizant of individual abilities and needs. (Transparency five---scene showing an instructor who is unaware of individual needs. "Recognition of Individual Needs")

   3. Hopefully, ratings will help the instructor become more sympathetic to the needs of the learner.

D. As a means of gathering data that is more <u>specific</u> and <u>objective</u> than relying on opinion and general feelings of successful teaching.

   1. A subjective basis for decision making can be misleading (Transparency six---scene showing the instructor who relies on general feeling as indicator of success. "Indicia of Success")

   2. Specific needs are illuminated when they are singled out for consideration.

3. Over-all improvement comes about by improvement in specific areas.

E. To demonstrate to students the concern that instructors have for them as learners.

1. The decision of the instructor to use student ratings is evidence of concern for the student.

2. Assurance is given to the student that the instructor desires feedback from the student. (Transparency seven---scene showing the instructor asking for learner reaction. "Student Feedback")

Orientation Treatment
Session Two
April 7, 1970

I. Introduction

Throughout the United States college students are demanding a greater voice in those activities that affect them. When opportunities to participate in decision-making are not provided, students devise means of drawing attention to their grievances.

Rating of teachers provides an orderly and constructive way of allowing students to participate and gives them a legitimate channel for the expression of opinions.

Students are regarded as paying consumers of our product with the inherent right to evaluate and make recommendations concerning the instruction they receive.

In spite of some unfortunate aspects of attempts at student rating of teachers, no one should suppose that the opinion of students concerning the teaching they receive is without significance. There is evidence by Bryan (1937), Leeds (1950), Starrock (1934) and Remmers (1963) to indicate that students are honest and reliable raters of teachers and that they can furnish valuable information even though they are not experts on teaching.

II. The Importance of Student Opinions

A. All persons involved in the learning process should have an opportunity to express themselves by evaluating those events that affect them.

B. Students at various levels of achievement should be given an opportunity to rate in order to get a cross-section of student views.

Woodburn (1966) reported on a study conducted at the University of Michigan concerning the validity of ratings by students with various academic achievement levels. He found the rating of teaching effectiveness by "D" and "E" students to be substantially the same as that of the "A" and "B" students about a particular instructor.

C. Students can supply information that is not available from other sources. Students are the only group who see their teachers perform in the classroom day after day. They can furnish valuable information that can be used to improve instruction and

PAGE 21-22 IS NOT AVAILABLE
FOR FILMING AT THIS TIME

provide a mirror that teachers may use to see themselves as others see them.

Significant information that only students can provide is:

1. Whether information aimed at them is getting acorss, or not.

2. Whether the instructor is confusing them or not.

3. Whether the test questions and grading system are reasonable and fair or not.

4. The quality of the presentations made in class by the teacher.

D. Since rating scales are anonymous students can communicate thei- evaluation to teachers without fear of reprisal.

E. Since student opinions are important, students have a responsibility to share their perceptions of instruction with the teacher. Teacher evaluation must be conceived as a process of appraisal where all elements that constitute a part of the teaching-learning process are given appropriate and fair consideration. Teaching and learning require interaction between student and teacher. The rating process provides feedback and is a contribution by the student to improved teacher effectiveness.

Orientation Treatment
Session Three
May 7, 1970

I. Introduction

A. Review purposes of rating

1. As a means of helping the instructor spot areas of strength and weakness.

2. As a stimulus to an instructor to continuously assess his teaching procedures and techniques.

3. To cause the instructor to become more sensitive to the needs of the learner.

4. As a means of gathering data that is more specific and objective than relying on opinions and general feelings of successful teaching.

5. To demonstrate to students the concern that instructors have for them as learners.

B. Review the importance of student opinions

1. Students can supply information that is not available from other sources.

2. Students at various levels of achievement should be given an opportunity to rate in order to get a cross-section of student views.

3. All persons involved in the learning process should have an opportunity to express themselves by evaluating those events that affect them.

4. Students have a responsibility to share their perceptions of instruction with the teacher.

5. Ratings are anonymous and students can communicate their evaluation to teachers without fear of reprisal.

II. Efforts Being Made by Our Faculty to Improve Instruction

A. Per cent of the faculty who have used the University of Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire.

B. Explain the visiting scholars program with Peabody College which is a means of sharing information that is designed to improve instruction.

C. Participation over a period of three years by eight faculty members in the West Tennessee Research Consortium program.

D. Faculty members who are involved in graduate study.

E. The program of audio-visual orientation that is available to the faculty and the extent of the participation.

III. The Use to be Made of Data Collected from Ratings

A. As a means of spotting strengths and weaknesses.

B. Results are sent to the teacher and department chairman. The teacher is encouraged to engage in self-evaluation.

C. The teacher has available the assistance of the Director of Testing in interpreting the results of rating and supplying suggestions that could be used in improving areas of weakness.

D. The ratings could serve as the basis for study groups. Teachers could meet together after receiving their ratings and discuss ways to improve instruction.

E. Student groups on some campuses collect the ratings and make them available to students who are contemplating enrollment in one of the instructor's classes.

IV. Possible Benefits to Students as a Result of Rating

A. Improved instruction.

B. Greater sensitivity to student needs.

C. Help students develop an awareness of the changing practices in education.

D. To help students moderate their expectations of teachers and not become discouraged when change comes slowly.

V. Summary

A. Review the three orientation sessions.

B. Invite comments and questions.